

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BARBARA LYNN CHAVEZ,

CV F 05-00490 REC DLB HC

Petitioner,

ORDER DENYING PETITIONER'S REQUEST
FOR EVIDENTIARY HEARING

V.

[Doc. 2]

GLORIA HENRY, WARDEN,

Respondent.

Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

Petitioner filed the instant petition for writ of habeas corpus on April 13, 2005, along with a request for an evidentiary hearing. Petitioner requests the Court to conduct an evidentiary hearing “to make determinations of factual issues addressed in the meritorious claims” in the petition for writ of habeas corpus.

Rule 8(a) provides that where a petition is not dismissed at a previous stage in the proceeding, the judge, after the answer and transcripts and record of the state court proceedings are filed, shall, *upon review* of those proceedings, determine whether an evidentiary hearing is required. The purpose of an evidentiary hearing is to resolve the merits of a factual dispute. An evidentiary hearing on a claim is required where it is clear from the petition that: (1) the allegations, if established, would entitle the petitioner to relief; and (2) the state court trier of fact has not reliably found the relevant facts. See, Hendricks v. Vasquez, 974 F.2d 1099, 1103

1 (9th Cir.1992). As the function of an evidentiary hearing is to try issues of fact, Townsend v. Sain
2 372 U.S. 293, 309 (1963)(*overruled in part by Keeney v. Tamayo-Reyes*, 504 U.S. 1, 112 S.Ct.
3 1715 (1993)), such a hearing is unnecessary when only issues of law are raised. Id.

4 In the instant case, Petitioner's only justification is to make determination of factual
5 issues addressed in the petition. As noted above, the purpose of an evidentiary hearing is to
6 resolve the merits of a *factual* dispute. Until the Court conducts a thorough review of the merits
7 of Petitioner's claims, it cannot be determined that a factual dispute necessitating an evidentiary
8 hearing is present. Following a thorough review of the petition's merits, the Court will sua
9 sponte issue an order for an evidentiary hearing should it find one necessary.

10 Accordingly, the request for an evidentiary hearing is DENIED.

11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12 Dated: May 19, 2005
13 3b142a

14 /s/ Dennis L. Beck
15 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28